

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, and 12 are pending in this application.

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,490, herein “Yanagi”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of pending Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

With regard to the pending claims, the outstanding Office Action asserts Yanagi as teaching some elements and asserts features not taught by Yanagi as “an obvious matter of design choice.”

As set out at MPEP § 2144.04(VI)(C), the mere fact that one could rearrange parts in the reference is not, by itself, sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The **prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the rearrangement**, according to the MPEP. Thus, the statement, at page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, that the rearrangement of Yanagi is justified by a lack of specificity in the application of a particular purpose of or problem solved by the arrangement applies an incorrect standard based on the MPEP.

Further, the application does discuss, at paragraphs [0018] to [0021] of the published Specification, for example, specific purposes and advantages of the claimed elements.

Additionally, the outstanding Office Action asserts that “Yanagi throughout his specification and figures discloses conical-shaped captured magnetic field distributions B.”

However, captured magnetic field distributions B do not teach or suggest “**spiral coils that generate a conical-shaped magnetic field distribution therebetween**,” as recited by independent Claims 1, 5, 6, and 7. As shown at Fig. 5, for example, “a:...MAGNETIC

FIELD PRODUCED BY COIL” is different than B, “the magnetic field...finally captured through the magnetizing procedure” as shown at Fig. 16(a), for example.

Because Yanagi fails to teach or suggest “spiral coils that generate a conical-shaped magnetic field distribution therebetween,” as recited by independent Claims 1, 5, 6, and 7, and also because the assertions of “an obvious matter of design choice” are not properly established in accordance with MPEP § 2144.04(VI)(C), Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 1, Claim 3, which depends therefrom, Claims 5, 6, and 7, and Claims 8, 11, and 12, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Usha Munukutla-Parker
Registration No. 61,939

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)